

speak, I think we ought to extend the same courtesy to every member of the Convention which was extended to my colleague yesterday.

As to what fell from the gentleman from Baltimore city (Mr. Abbott) in advocating his amendment, I say that these are the most important points that will be before the Convention for its consideration during its session. I believe that the Convention of 1850 occupied six or eight weeks, and perhaps longer, in considering the Declaration of Rights. The gentleman forgets that time was made for slaves and not for freemen, particularly in the consideration of the organic law of the State, and these vital principles which affect the interests of every citizen; we have no right to abridge the representatives of the people here upon this floor, from discussing the questions which may so vitally affect their interests. I am here to discharge my duty as a member of this Convention; and I desire to do it with equal courtesy towards every member of the Convention. I will go as far as the furthest in protecting every man in his rights and in the honest discharge of his duty as a member of this body. I hope neither the original order nor the amendment will be adopted by the Convention. I have no doubt that there are not three members on this floor who will occupy over an hour in discussing this subject; but I do not think we ought to be abridged, particularly in the consideration of the article now before the Convention.

Mr. DENNIS. I have the less hesitation in opposing this order, because I feel very sure that I will not come under the operation of it. At the same time I am free to say that those gentlemen who wish to speak at length on this question or any other question, so far as it is a reasonable time, should be allowed that privilege. The gentleman from Baltimore ought to remember that most of us here are but ordinary mortals. We are but flesh and blood. We are not like the gentleman from Baltimore, who springs like Minerva from the head of Jove, full armed and equipped at all points, at once into existence. We come here but as men. I had supposed we were here seeking the old principles of Government; that we were trying to get at the foundations upon which the Government rests, to retrace the old beaten paths and go back to the original lights, not as the gentleman says the "old exploded doctrines," but the true, original basis of the Constitution.

I affirm that this article now pending is unknown in the history of this land. I dare say that it is now for the first time in the history of this nation, either National or State, proposed to incorporate into a bill of rights the doctrine of allegiance to the General Government. It is a new doctrine. It is not "exploded." Although the gentleman has charged upon the gentleman from Prince George's (Mr. Clarke) the exploded doctrines

of Calhoun, whether that be so or not, the incorporation of this article is a new thing, heretofore unknown, now for the first time proposed. If the gentleman from Baltimore city (Mr. Abbott) wishes for but half an hour, he gets all he asks; and he ought to extend to each other gentleman the same, all that he asks. I go for free press, free speech, and liberty.

Mr. CLARKE. I am for the first time informed since coming into this Hall, that I was accused by the gentleman from Baltimore city (Mr. Abbott) with having enunciated yesterday the doctrines of Calhoun.

The PRESIDENT. He has disclaimed any reflection.

Mr. ABBOTT. And I did not say that he had "enunciated them."

Mr. CLARKE. I thought he said I had announced the doctrines of Calhoun, and I wish to explain. I expressly stated in my argument the principles I advocated; and if they were not clearly enough expressed for the gentleman to understand, they will be in print. In the remarks I offered yesterday, I made no reference to and read no quotation from John C. Calhoun. On the contrary, I quoted from the Debates in the Convention, from the Federalist, from the decisions of the Supreme Court, and from Vattel. When in the course of my argument I reached the point where Jackson and Calhoun divided, where one claimed the right of secession as a constitutional right, and when I reached the point where Mr. Hayne and Webster departed from each other in reference to the right of secession, Webster claiming it to be a revolutionary right, I quoted from Jackson and Webster, and followed it up by a quotation from Mr. Lincoln, and I went into an elaborate argument in review of the propositions advanced by John C. Calhoun.

Mr. SANDS. I submit to the Chair that the gentleman is not in order.

Mr. CLARKE. I have made my explanation.

Mr. SANDS. I wish to state my point of order. I think I have a right to do that.

The PRESIDENT. The gentleman will reduce it to writing.

Mr. SANDS (after complying). Although I was not aware of any parliamentary law or rule of order adopted by the Convention requiring it, I have reduced the point of order to writing, and it is this:

"The point of order raised is that the gentleman can at this time only rise to a personal explanation, and as the gentleman from Baltimore expressly disclaimed any personal discourtesy to the gentleman from Prince George's, the matter is at an end. The gentleman has no right at this time to explain the mere argument of yesterday."

Mr. CLARKE. I did not rise for the purpose of replying to any personal reflection; but I understood the gentleman from Baltimore city to have made an assertion of fact,